

Yeas—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Belt, Berry, of Prince George's, Billingsley, Blackiston, Briscoe, Brooks, Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Cunningham, Davis, of Charles, Dennis, Duvall, Edelen, Gale, Harwood, Henkle, Hodson, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, King, Lansdale, Lee, Marbury, Markey, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Parker, Parran, Peter, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Dorchester, Sykes, Wilmer—36.

Nays—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Barron, Carter, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hatch, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, Kennard, Larsh, McComas, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Noble, Nyman, Pugh, Ridgely, Robinette, Schley, Schlusser, Scott, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Thruston, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—46.

The following explanations were made by members as their names were called:

Mr. BARRON. I want to vote on this order, and I do not want to vote to lay it on the table. At the same time I want to give gentlemen full opportunity to debate this question. Now, I want to state just one thing to show how I am situated, and to explain my vote. I met a man this morning who had a lucrative office, in which he was getting \$2,500 a year, while I am down here at Annapolis, getting five dollars a day. Now, I shall vote "no" on this question at this time, and I am very sorry that gentlemen attempt to please their constituents by cutting off debate.

Mr. VALLIANT. I vote "no" because I desire to offer an amendment to the order, if the motion to lay on the table be voted down.

The motion to lay on the table was not agreed to.

The question recurred upon adopting the order.

Mr. STIRLING. I move to amend the order by striking out the words, "half-past five o'clock this afternoon," and inserting the words, "twelve o'clock to-morrow." I know a number of gentlemen who desire to speak upon this subject and half-past five this afternoon may be cutting the time rather short. But I think the time I have indicated is time enough to close this debate, and I have a fair regard for that courtesy which should always obtain between the members of this Convention. In regard to the suggestion that this question cannot be discussed in an hour, that argument amounts to just nothing at all. It cannot be discussed in an hour; it cannot be fully discussed in two hours, nor in three hours. But the subject has already been discussed by the ablest minds of this country, until their arguments and speeches have become volumes enough to fill libraries. If it is proposed that this Convention shall take time enough to go over all the ground

which was gone over by the great men of twenty and thirty years ago, then we might as well adjourn. It is not to be expected that the members of this Convention shall undertake to repeat the labors of Mr. Webster or Mr. Calhoun. The people do not expect us to discuss this subject fully. We can do nothing more than to review the subject generally. We can no more undertake to review the whole subject, than a man in a sermon of thirty minutes can undertake to review the whole Bible. You might as well expect a man to preach ten volumes upon theology, as to expect to fully discuss this question.

Mr. PUGH moved to amend the order by striking out the word "to-day," and inserting the words, "on Thursday next," so that the order would read—"debate on the 4th article of the Declaration of Rights shall cease at half-past five o'clock next Thursday afternoon."

The PRESIDENT. The question will be first taken upon the motion of the gentleman from Cecil, (Mr. Pugh,) as involving the longest time.

Mr. CHAMBERS. One word in reply to the criticism made upon the remark I used, that this subject could not be discussed in an hour. I do not wish the Convention to understand, from my making that remark, that it is any part whatever of my purpose to go over the discussion which has heretofore occupied the minds of such men as Daniel Webster, Colonel Hayne, Mr. Calhoun, and others. According to my present expectation, without having made one solitary note upon the subject, I shall not be upon the mercy of the House to the extent of the limit already fixed. But there are gentlemen who take a different view of the matter, and it is not for me dogmatically to say that the debate should be suppressed. If gentlemen deem it necessary, in going into this discussion, to either repeat or add to the arguments heretofore used by those able statesmen, they ought to have the privilege of doing so. Arrangements have been made for reporting and printing our debates, and I do not think members should be limited in the way they have been. However, I rose chiefly to disabuse any individual member of this body, if there be any such, who may have supposed, from what I said a few minutes ago in addressing the Chair, that I had any reference to my own position. I have not a desire to consume more than an hour, and not the slightest desire to enter into the discussions which occupied the attention of men many years ago. I have my opinions, and may express them; but as for going over that discussion, I have not the slightest idea of doing so.

The question was then taken upon the motion of Mr. Pugh, to so amend the order that it shall read, "debate on the fourth article